



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,624	12/04/2003	Ali Alavi	53470.003060	5743

21967 7590 02/23/2006

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

WU, YICUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MAILED

FEB 23 2006

Technology Center 2100

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/726,624
Filing Date: December 04, 2003
Appellant(s): ALAVI ET AL.

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington DC, 20006-1109
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Art Unit: 2165

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/30/2005
appealing from the Office action mailed 3/21/2005.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained
in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and
interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected
by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is
contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the
brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after
final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2165

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Prior Art of Record

Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,253)

Brooke et al. (U.S. Patent 6,748,569).

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,253) in view of Brooke et al. (U.S. Patent 6,748,569).

As to Claim 1, Thompson et al. discloses a web interface system for use with a business information system, the web

Art Unit: 2165

interface system providing an interface to a user and comprising:

a first set of HTML interface tools located on a business intelligence server (Fig. 1) the first set of HTML interface tools including at least one of spreadsheet tools, graphing tools, auto-prompt tools, and report generation and management tools (i.e. report generation/data retrieval) (Fig. 1);

second set of HTML interface tools located on a web server (i.e. web server) (Fig. 1 and Col. 30, lines 59- col. 31 line 4 and col. 60, lines 61-67), the second set of HTML interface tools including at least one of navigation tools (Fig. 2); and

means for providing communication between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the user, such that the user is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools (Fig. 1-2).

Thompson et al. does not teach internationalization tools.

Brooke et al. teach internationalization tools (XML supports European, Middle Eastern, African, and Asian languages, and all conforming processors support the Unicode character set encodings) (col. 2, lines 5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2165

have modified Thompson et al. to include internationalization tools.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson et al. by the teaching of Brooke et al. to include internationalization tools with the motivation to improve the flexibility as taught by Brooke et al. (col. 3, lines 11-12).

As to Claim 2, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the first set of HTML interface tools located on the business intelligence server obtains results through communication with a plurality of storage facilities (Thompson et al. Fig. 9).

As to Claim 3, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the plurality of storage devices includes cache files, object-data, and a data warehouse (Thompson et al. Fig. 9 and col. 31, line 55).

Art Unit: 2165

As to Claim 4, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the auto-prompting tools comprise means for enabling a client to specify filtering criteria (i.e. EIM provides the ability to create user definable parameters for querying the data warehouse and filtering information) (Thompson et al. col. 10, lines 1-16).

As to Claim 5, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the auto-prompting tools additionally comprise DHTML tools (i.e. generate the DHTML necessary for the EIM application) (Thompson et al. col. 31, lines 1-5).

As to Claim 6, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the report generation and management tools comprise means for enabling the user to specify the full report to be viewed (Thompson et al. Fig. 2).

As to Claim 7, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

Art Unit: 2165

the report generation and management tools additionally comprise pull-down menus in HTML (Thompson et al. Fig. 2-8).

As to Claim 8, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the report generation and management tools comprise DHTML or HTML pivoting tools for enabling movement of attributes within an executed report (Thompson et al. col. 21, lines 7-67).

As to Claim 9, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the spreadsheet tools comprise means for providing features to the user including at least one of pop-up menus for controlling, drilling, outlining, sorting, and formatting options (i.e. a so-called "outline mode" provides the ability to view data hierarchically showing subtotals at chosen levels of detail) (Thompson et al. col. 9, lines 35-42).

As to Claim 10, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

additional HTML spreadsheet functions provided on the web server (i.e. spreadsheet) (Thompson et al. col. 9, lines 35-42).

As to Claim 11, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the graphing tools comprise means for generating a graph inside of the business intelligence server and creating a file for transmitting to the web server computer for insertion of the graph into HTML (graph... delivered by EIM is preferably through Dynamic HTML pages.) (Thompson et al. col. 30, lines 52-59).

As to Claim 12, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the internationalization tools comprise means for communicating in one of a plurality of languages (Brooke et al. col. 2, lines 5-9).

As to Claim 13, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a Web interface system wherein

the navigation tools comprise means for simultaneous display of toolbars, menus, and a grid to the user (Thompson et al. Fig. 3-8).

As to Claim 14, Thompson et al. discloses a method for providing a web interface for a user-through the use of a web

Art Unit: 2165

server and a business intelligence server, the method comprising the steps of,

loading a first set of HTML interface tools on the business intelligence server (Fig. 1), the first set of HTML interface tools including at least one of spreadsheet tools, graphing tools, auto-prompt tools (i.e. report generation/data retrieval) (Fig. 1), and

report generation and management tools; loading a second set of HTML interface tools located on the web server (i.e. web server) (Fig. 1), the second set of HTML interface tools including at least one of navigation tools (Fig. 2); and

providing communication means between the business intelligence server, the web server, and the user, such that the user is able to utilize the first set of HTML interface tools and the second set of HTML interface tools (Fig. 1-2).

Thompson et al. does not teach internationalization tools.

Brooke et al. teach internationalization tools (XML supports European, Middle Eastern, African, and Asian languages, and all conforming processors support the Unicode character set encodings) (col. 2, lines 5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson et al. with internationalization tools.

Art Unit: 2165

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson et al. by the teaching of Brooke et al. because providing internationalization tools allows the improvements of flexibility. as taught by Brooke et al. (col. 3, lines 11-12).

As to Claim 15, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a method further comprising the step of providing

a plurality of storage devices for communication with the first set of HTML interface tools on the business intelligence server, wherein the plurality of storage devices includes cache files, object data, and a data warehouse (Thompson et al. Fig. 9 and col. 31, line 55).

As to Claim 16, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a method further comprising the step of

loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading DHTML auto-prompting tools having means for enabling the user to specify filtering criteria (i.e. EIM provides the ability to create user definable parameters for querying the data warehouse and filtering information) (Thompson et al. col. 10, lines 1-16).

As to Claim 17, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a method wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading means for enabling the user to specify the full report to be viewed and means for providing pull-down menus in HTML (Thompson et al. Fig. 2).

As to Claim 18, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a method wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading DHTML or HTML pivoting tools for enabling movement of attributes within an executed report (Thompson et al. col. 21, lines 7-67).

As to Claim 19, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a method wherein the step of loading the first set of HTML interface tools comprises loading means

for displaying features to the user, the features including pop-up menus for controlling drilling, outlining, sorting, and formatting options (i.e. a so-called "outline mode" provides the ability to view data hierarchically showing subtotals at chosen levels of detail) (Thompson et al. col. 9, lines 35-42).

Art Unit: 2165

As to Claim 20, Thompson et al. as modified teaches a method further comprising loading additional HTML spreadsheet functions provided on the web server (i.e. a so-called "outline mode" provides the ability to view data hierarchically showing subtotals at chosen levels of detail) (Thompson et al. col. 9, lines 35-42).

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues that "The Office has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness for any of the independent claims.

In response to the applicants' arguments regarding "obviousness", and "motivation" to combine the cited references, the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Art Unit: 2165

In this case, both cited references teach inventions that are in the same field of endeavor. Both Thompson et al., and Brooke et al. teaches about web server, html interface, the primary reference, Thompson et al., teaches every limitation of the independent claims, with the exception of internationalization tools (XML. The secondary reference, Brooke et al. teaches this limitation, and therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gills et al by the teaching of Brooke et al. to include internationalization tools with the motivation to improve the flexibility as taught by Brooke et al. (col. 3, lines 11-12).

Appellant argues that "Nothing ... teaches ... located on a web server".

In response, Examiner maintains that Thompson et al., (i.e. web server)(Fig. 1, item 106) and ("The web server 106 that EIM integrates is preferably Microsoft's Internet Information Server (IIS) version 4.0 running on Windows NT 4.0. Col. 30, lines 59-col. 31 line 4 and col. 60, lines 61-67) Clearly teaches EIM is located on a web server. "The ASP pages generate the DHTML necessary for the EIM application." And "These HTML pages, static in nature, are accessible through the EIM system and

Art Unit: 2165

allow an enterprise to distribute their financial statements and other financial reports electronically" clearly teaches HTML interface tools are located on a web server.

Appellant argues that "The Office failed to identify where in Brooke that such a teaching is made.

In response, Examiner maintains that Brooke et al. (XML is also used in certain metadata applications. XML supports European, Middle Eastern, African, and Asian languages, and all conforming processors support the Unicode character set encodings" col. 2, lines 5-9 clearly teaches an international tool.

Applicant's specification page 16, lines 10-11 (European languages, Korean, Japanese" clearly shows that Brooke et al.'s teaching could be construed as an international tool.

Appellant argues that "The Office never addresses the location issue".

In response, Examiner maintains that Examiner only stated Thompson et al. in combination with Brooke et al. teaches about applicant's invention. Examiner relied upon Thompson et al., to teach applicant "on a web server" and relied upon Brooke et al. to include internationalization tools. In addition, Examiner

Art Unit: 2165

believes Brooke et al. also teaches 'tools located on a web server' (i.e. XSP processor 202 resides on web server. Brooke et al. Col. 7, lines 20-43).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 2165

Respectfully submitted,

Yicun Wu

Patent Examiner AU 2165

February 9, 2006 Conferees

_____ SPE Jeffrey Gaffin AU 2165

_____ SPE ALAM HOSAIN AU 2166

Handwritten signatures of Jeffrey Gaffin and Alam Hosain. The signature for Jeffrey Gaffin is written above the signature for Alam Hosain.